



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: 700 LEAVESLICKER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, DC 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10 031,205	01 10 2002	Gilles Rousset	160383,90261	2456

26710 7590 07 17 2002  
QUARLES & BRADY LLP  
411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE  
SUITE 2040  
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497

EXAMINER
----------

FORTUNA, JOSE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1731

DATE MAILED: 07 17 2002

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

14

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/031,205	ROUSSEL ET AL
	Examiner José A Fortuna	Art Unit 1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____   |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 1731

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in France on May 12, 2000. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the French application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

### *Specification*

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it references a figure, Figure 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims and the specification indicate that the embossed web is creped. However, there is no indication in the examples that any of the plies is creped, so it is unclear if this is done or applicant is referring to the actual embossing.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1731

6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. In claim 1 it is unclear if the embossed ply is creped before embossing or not. In claims 1 and 8, a broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 1 recites the broad recitation of the area of the top being 1 mm<sup>2</sup>, and the claim also recites that the area is less than 0.7 mm<sup>2</sup> which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation. A broad range or limitation followed by linking terms (e.g., **preferably**, maybe, for instance, especially) and a narrow range or limitation within the broad range or limitation is considered indefinite since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired.

Art Unit: 1731

Claim 11 is vague and indefinite as to the meaning of "associated."

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

9. Claims 1, 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hoeft et al., FR 2 775 698, (Derwent Abstract).

Hoeft et al. teach a multi-ply tissue having an un-embossed ply sandwiched between two embossed plies, see abstract. In the abstract Hoeft et al. teach that the grammage of the tissue is between 36-106 g/m<sup>2</sup> which is within the claimed range and teach that the grammage of plies is between 12-35 g/m<sup>2</sup>. Hoeft et al. teach also that the embossed plies have more than 30 protuberances per cm<sup>2</sup>. The bonding of the plies by adhesive is also taught, see abstract.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1731

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Column.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. Claims 2-9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoeft et al.

Hoeft et al. are not explicit regarding the difference of grammage, nor the tearing and toughness difference nor the use of a second un-embossed ply. However, optimizing result effective variables, such as the difference in grammage, toughness, and tearing and the use of another un-embossed ply, is within the levels of ordinary skill in the art, absent a showing of unexpected results. Note that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that altering those properties would alter the softness and/or the breaking property of the web.

13. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babinsky et al, US Patent No. 5,374,468.

Regarding Claims 1, 10-14, Babinsky et al teach a multi-ply tissue having an embossed ply sandwiched between two un-embossed plies, see abstract. Even though Babinsky et al is silent

Art Unit: 1731

with respect to the grammage of the web and the individual plies, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that tissues and board falls within the claimed range and therefore, making such a web with the teaching of Babinsky et al. would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Note also that using more than 30 discrete protuberances for embossing is well known in the art, as evidence by Hoeft et al. above, and therefore using more than 30 protuberances to emboss the ply would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Regarding claims 2-9, Babinsky et al are not explicit regarding the difference of grammage, the tearing and toughness difference nor the use of a second un-embossed ply. However, optimizing result effective variables, such as the difference in grammage, toughness, and tearing and the use of another un-embossed ply, is within the levels of ordinary skill in the art, absent a showing of unexpected results. Note that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that altering those properties would alter the softness and/or the breaking property of the web.

### *Conclusion*

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure in the art of "Embossed Multi-ply Tissue."

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José Fortuna, whose telephone number is (703)305-7498. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin, can be reached on (703)308-1164. The fax number for this group is (703)305-7115.

Art Unit: 1731

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

When filing a FAX in group 1730, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communication with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

José A. Fortuna  
July 12, 2002

  
**JOSÉ FORTUNA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 1731**